of such derivative and in juxtaposition therewith the statement "Warning—May be habit forming."

Further misbranding, Section 502 (f) (2), the labeling of the repackaged *sulfadiazine tablets* bore no warning against use in those pathological conditions where their use may be dangerous to health, and against unsafe dosage and methods and duration of administration.

DISPOSITION: September 21, 1951. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of $100 against the defendants jointly.

3559. Misbranding of pentobarbital sodium capsules and Tuinal capsules. U. S. v. Carolina Pharmacy and T. Philip Lloyd. Pleas of nolo contendere. Fine of $500 against defendants jointly. Individual also placed on probation for 2 years. (F. D. C. No. 30588. Sample Nos. 81985-K, 82041-K, 82043-K, 82085-K, 82088-K.)

INFORMATION FILED: June 21, 1951, Middle District of North Carolina, against the Carolina Pharmacy, a partnership, Chapel Hill, N. C., and T. Philip Lloyd, a partner in the partnership.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT: From the States of Georgia and Indiana into the State of North Carolina, of quantities of *pentobarbital sodium capsules* and *Tuinal capsules*.

ALLEGED VIOLATION: On or about July 17, September 27 and 29, and October 5, 1950, while the drugs were being held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, the defendants caused various quantities of the drugs to be repacked and sold without a physician's prescription, which acts resulted in the repackaged drugs being misbranded.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (b) (1), a portion of the repackaged *pentobarbital sodium capsules* failed to bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and, Section 502 (b) (2), all of the repackaged drugs failed to bear labels containing statements of the quantity of the contents.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (d), the drugs contained chemical derivatives or barbituric acid, which derivatives have been found to be, and by regulations designated as, habit forming; and the label of the repackaged drugs failed to bear the name, and quantity or proportion of such derivatives and in juxtaposition therewith the statement "Warning—May be habit forming."

Further misbranding, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the repackaged drugs failed to bear adequate directions for use since the directions "Dose One" appearing on the labeling of a portion of the repackaged drugs were not adequate directions for use and since the labeling of the remainder of the repackaged drugs bore no directions for use.

DISPOSITION: September 24, 1951. Pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of $500 against the defendants jointly and placed the individual defendant on probation for 2 years on the condition that he keep an accurate record of all sales of the drugs involved and have the records available for inspection at all times.

3560. Misbranding of diethylstilbestrol perles. U. S. v. Standard Pharmacy and Thomas L. White. Pleas of guilty. Fine of $150 against each defendant. (F. D. C. No. 30613. Sample No. 82195-K.)

INFORMATION FILED: July 19, 1951, Northern District of Georgia, against the Standard Pharmacy, a corporation, Atlanta, Ga., and Thomas L. White, president of the corporation.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT: From the State of Michigan into the State of Georgia, of a quantity of *diethylstilbestrol perles.*

ALLEGED VIOLATION: On or about November 2, 1950, while the drug was being held for sale at the Standard Pharmacy after shipment in interstate commerce, the Standard Pharmacy and Thomas L. White caused a number of the *diethylstilbestrol perles* to be repacked and sold without a physician's prescription, which acts resulted in the repackaged drugs being misbranded.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Sections 502 (b) (1) and (2), the repackaged drug bore no label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, or a statement of the quantity of the contents; Section 502 (e) (1), the repackaged drug bore no label containing the common or usual name of the drug; and, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the repackaged drug bore no directions for use.

DISPOSITION: September 28, 1951. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of $150 against each defendant.

3561. Misbranding of dextro-amphetamine sulfate tablets and phenobarbital tablets. U. S. v. Alexander Canales, Sr., (West Dallas Drug Store), and Edmund L. Hall. Pleas of guilty. Fine of $1,000 against Defendant Canales and fine of $500 against Defendant Hall. Jail sentence of 6 months against each defendant suspended; each defendant placed on probation. (F. D. C. No. 30575. Sample Nos. 54210–K, 75121–K, 75123–K to 75126–K, incl.)

INFORMATION FILED: September 17, 1951, Northern District of Texas, against Alexander Canales, Sr., trading as the West Dallas Drug Store, Dallas, Tex., and Edmund L. Hall, a pharmacist in the drug store.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT: From the States of Pennsylvania and Indiana into the State of Texas, quantities of *dextro-amphetamine sulfate tablets* and *phenobarbital tablets.*

ALLEGED VIOLATION: On or about July 7, 9, 11, and 13, 1950, while the drugs were being held for sale at the West Dallas Drug Store after shipment in interstate commerce, various quantities of the drugs were repacked and sold without a prescription, which acts resulted in the repackaged drugs being misbranded.

Alexander Canales, Sr., was charged with causing the acts of repacking and sale of the drugs involved in each of the 6 counts of the information; and, in addition, Edmund L. Hall was charged in one count with causing such acts to be done in connection with the drug involved in that count.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (b) (1), the repackaged *phenobarbital tablets* and portions of the repackaged *dextro-amphetamine sulfate tablets* failed to bear labels containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; Section 502 (b) (2), the repackaged drugs bore no labels containing statements of the quantity of the contents; and, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the repackaged drugs bore no directions for use.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (d), the *phenobarbital tablets* contained a chemical derivative of barbituric acid, which derivative has been found to be, and by regulations designated as, habit forming; and the label of the repackaged tablets failed to bear the name, and quantity or proportion of such derivative and in juxtaposition therewith the statement "Warning—May be habit forming."